



MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

525 South Main Street~Ukiah~California~95482
www.mendocinocog.org

NEPHELE BARRETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Administration: Suite B
(707) 463-1859
Transportation Planning: Suite G
(707) 234-3434

AGENDA

Monday, November 7, 2022 at 1:30 p.m.

Teleconference

Zoom videoconference link provided to Council members and by request.

Please submit access request to

info@mendocinocog.org or call MCOG Administration at (707) 463-1859.

Audio Call-in Option: 1 (669) 900-6833 (in CA)
Meeting ID: 857 9750 0814 Passcode: 016694

Attachments Posted

[Board of Directors - Mendocino Council of Governments \(mendocinocog.org\)](https://www.mendocinocog.org)

Additional Media

For live streaming and later viewing:

<https://www.youtube.com/>, search for Mendocino County Video, or
[YouTube link at http://www.mendocinocog.org](http://www.mendocinocog.org) under Meetings

The Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) meets as the Board of Directors of:
Mendocino Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) and
Mendocino County Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE)

NOTICE: This meeting of the Mendocino Council of Governments will be conducted by teleconference (audio and video) and not available for in-person public participation, pursuant to the Assembly Bill 361, Brown Act: Remote Meetings During a State of Emergency. In order to minimize the risk of exposure to COVID-19, the public may participate in lieu of personal attendance in several ways. Since opportunities during the meeting are limited, we encourage submitting comments in advance.

- In advance of the meeting: comments may be sent by email to info@mendocinocog.org or by using the form at <https://www.mendocinocog.org/contact-us>, to be read aloud into the public record.
- During the meeting: email comments to info@mendocinocog.org or send comments using the form at <https://www.mendocinocog.org/contact-us>, to be made available as soon as possible to the Board of Directors, staff, and the general public as they are received and processed by staff.
- During the meeting: make oral comments on the conference call by phone or video when public comment is invited by the Chair.

Thanks to all for your interest and cooperation.

NOTE: All items are considered for action unless otherwise noted.

1. Call to Order and Roll Call
2. Convene as RTPA
3. Recess as RTPA – Reconvene as Policy Advisory Committee

CONSENT CALENDAR

The following items are considered for approval in accordance with Administrative Staff, Committee, and/or Directors' recommendations and will be enacted by a single motion. Items may be removed from the Consent Calendar for separate consideration, upon request by a Director or citizen.

4. Adoption of Resolution No. M2022-19 Making Continued Findings Pursuant to Assembly Bill 361 to Conduct Public Meetings Remotely for MCOG's Legislative and Advisory Bodies During the COVID-19 State of Emergency
5. Approval of October 3, 2022 Minutes

PUBLIC EXPRESSION – *Please refer to notice at top of this Agenda.*

6. Participation is welcome in Council meetings. Comments will be limited to three minutes per person and not more than ten minutes per subject, so that everyone can be heard. "Public Expression" time is limited to matters under the Council's jurisdiction that may not have been considered by the Council previously and are not on the agenda. No action will be taken. Members of the public may comment also during specific agenda items when recognized by the Chair.

REGULAR CALENDAR

7. Presentation and Acceptance of Transportation Development Act (TDA) Triennial Performance Audits – *Moore & Associates*
 - a. Mendocino Council of Governments
 - b. Mendocino Transit Authority
8. Approval of Internal Cash Flow Loans for Construction Phase of Covelo SR 162 Corridor Multi-Purpose Trail and Report of Current Activity

RATIFY ACTION

9. Recess as Policy Advisory Committee – Reconvene as RTPA – Ratify Action of Policy Advisory Committee

REPORTS

10. Reports – Information – *No Action*
 - a. Caltrans District 1 – Projects Update and Information
 - b. Mendocino Transit Authority
 - c. Great Redwood Trail Agency
 - d. MCOG Staff - Summary of Meetings
 - e. MCOG Administration Staff
 - i. 2023 Active Transportation Program (ATP) Grant Awards – CTC Staff Recommendations
 - ii. Miscellaneous
 - iii. Next Meeting Date – Monday, December 5, 2022
 - f. MCOG Planning Staff – *verbal reports*
 - i. Feasibility Study - Mobility Solutions for Rural Communities of Inland Mendocino County
 - ii. Feasibility Study - Mendocino Transit Authority's Ukiah Transit Center
 - iii. Miscellaneous
 - g. MCOG Directors
 - h. California Association of Councils of Governments (CALCOG) Delegates - Annual Regional Leadership Forum, March 6-8, 2023 in Riverside

ADJOURNMENT

11. Adjourn

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (ADA) and TRANSLATION REQUESTS

Persons who require special accommodations, accessible seating, or documentation in alternative formats under the Americans with Disabilities Act, or persons who require interpretation services (free of charge) are advised to contact the MCOG office at (707) 463-1859, **at least five days** before the meeting.

Las personas que requieren alojamiento especial, asientos accesibles, o documentación en formatos alternativos de acuerdo con la Ley de Estadounidenses con Discapacidades, o personas que requieren servicios de interpretación (sin cargo) deben comunicarse con MCOG (707) 463-1859, por lo menos cinco días antes de la reunión.

ADDITIONS TO AGENDA

The Brown Act, Section 54954.2, states that the Board may take action on off-agenda items when:

- a) a majority vote determines that an “emergency situation” exists as defined in Section 54956.5, **or**
- b) a two-thirds vote of the body, or a unanimous vote of those present, determines that there is a need to take immediate action and the need for action arose after the agenda was legally posted, **or**
- c) the item was continued from a prior, legally posted meeting not more than five calendar days before this meeting.

CLOSED SESSION

If agendaized, MCOG may adjourn to a closed session to consider litigation or personnel matters (i.e. contractor agreements). Discussion of litigation or pending litigation may be held in closed session by authority of Govt. Code Section 54956.9; discussion of personnel matters by authority of Govt. Code Section 54957.

POSTED 10/31/2022

Next Resolution Number: M2022-20

MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

BOARD of DIRECTORS

RESOLUTION No. M2022-19

MAKING CONTINUED FINDINGS PURSUANT TO ASSEMBLY BILL 361
TO CONDUCT REMOTE PUBLIC MEETINGS FOR MCOG'S
LEGISLATIVE AND ADVISORY BODIES
DURING THE COVID-19 STATE OF EMERGENCY

WHEREAS,

1. The Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) is committed to preserving and fostering public access and participation in its meetings, as required by the Ralph M. Brown Act (Cal. Government Code 54950 – 54963), which makes provisions for remote teleconferencing participation in meetings by members of a legislative body, subject to the existence of certain conditions;
2. A state of emergency was proclaimed by Governor's Executive Order N-33-20 on March 4, 2020, addressing the threat of the COVID-19 pandemic, and remains in effect with certain modifications added since the original order, as part of a phased rollback of Executive Orders in response to the pandemic;
3. On September 16, 2021, the Governor signed into law AB 361, an urgency measure, that provides flexibility to government bodies, allowing them to meet virtually without conforming to the Brown Act teleconferencing rules during a declared state of emergency if: (a) State or local officials have imposed or recommended measures to promote social distancing, (b) the legislative body is meeting to determine whether, as a result of the emergency, meeting in person presents imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees, or (c) the legislative body has determined that meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees; AB 361 remains in effect through January 1, 2024;
4. In a June 30, 2022 report of the Rural Association of Northern California Public Health Officers (RANCHO) response to recent increases in COVID-19 cases, it was noted that "COVID-19 projections indicate that CA will continue to see increasing cases...Northern California counties generally lag behind the rest of CA for increased cases. This swell of infections is largely due to the highly transmissible BA.2.12.1 Omicron variant, which is already being displaced by the new and even more transmissible BA.4 and BA.5 subvariants."
5. The Mendocino County Public Health Officer continues to recommend teleconferencing during public meetings of all legislative bodies to protect the community's health against the spread of COVID-19, based in part on the continued increased safety protection that physical/social distancing provides as one means by which to reduce the risk of COVID-19 transmission;

6. Given the heightened risks of the predominant variant of COVID-19 in the community, holding meetings with all members of the legislative body, staff, and the public in attendance in person in a shared indoor meeting space may pose an unnecessary and immediate risk to attendees;
7. These virtual meetings have not diminished the public's ability to observe and participate and have expanded opportunities to do so for some communities, and MCOG continues to provide for public access to its remote meetings; and
8. On October 4, 2021, MCOG's Board of Directors made findings of fact by Resolution #M2021-12 including additional background and pertinent details; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, THAT:

- The Mendocino Council of Governments adopts the recitals set forth above as findings of fact.
- MCOG has reconsidered circumstances of the state of emergency.
- MCOG hereby determines that the state of emergency continues to directly impact the ability of the members to meet safely in person.
- In accordance with AB 361, based on the findings and determinations herein, meetings of MCOG's legislative and advisory bodies will be held remotely by virtual means, suspending Brown Act teleconferencing rules while providing for all feasible means of public participation.
- This resolution shall be effective upon adoption and remain in effect until MCOG's next regular board meeting on December 5, 2022, when MCOG shall consider renewing its findings by subsequent resolution, in accordance with AB 361, or shall resume meeting in person.

ADOPTION OF THIS RESOLUTION was moved by Director _____, seconded by Director _____, and approved on this 7th day of November, 2022, by the following roll call vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAINING:

ABSENT:

WHEREUPON, the Chairman declared the resolution adopted, AND SO ORDERED.

ATTEST: Nephele Barrett, Executive Director

Dan Gjerde, Chair

MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Agenda # 5
Consent Calendar
MCOG Meeting
11/07/2022

MINUTES

Monday, October 3, 2022

Teleconference Only

Pursuant to Brown Act and Assembly Bill 361

The Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) meets as the Board of Directors of:

Mendocino Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) and
Mendocino County Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE)

1. Call to Order / Roll Call. The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m. with Directors Jim Brown, Tess Albin-Smith, Greta Kanne, Scott Ignacio, John Haschak, Michael Carter, Tatiana Ahlstrand (Caltrans/PAC), and Dan Gjerde present by Zoom teleconference; Chair Gjerde presiding.

Staff present: Nephela Barrett, Executive Director; Janet Orth, Deputy Director & CFO; Loretta Ellard, Deputy Planner; James Sookne, Program Manager; and Jody Lowblad, Administrative Assistant. Alicia Meier of Mendocino County Dept. of Transportation was on hand to report under Agenda Item #8. Julia Peterson of Caltrans District 1 was available to report under Agenda Item #10a.

Note: Public comment was invited via email and online comment form; staff monitored for incoming comments throughout the meeting, reporting periodically.

2. Convene as RTPA

3. Recess as RTPA – Reconvene as Policy Advisory Committee

4 - 5. Consent Calendar. Executive Director Barrett requested that Item #4 be pulled for discussion.

4. Adoption of Resolution Making Continued Findings Pursuant to Assembly Bill 361 to Conduct Public Meetings Remotely for MCOG’s Legislative and Advisory Bodies During the COVID-19 State of Emergency. Noting information learned after the agenda packet was distributed, Ms. Orth described staff’s recommendation, under the whereas recitals, to delete Paragraphs 4 and 6 as outdated, to change the word “would” to “may” in Paragraph 7, and to adopt the resolution as amended.

Upon motion by Albin-Smith, second by Haschak, and carried unanimously on roll call vote (*8 Ayes – Brown, Kanne, Albin-Smith, Ignacio, Haschak, Carter, Ahlstrand/PAC, and Gjerde; 0 Noes; 0 Abstaining; 0 Absent*): IT IS ORDERED that the resolution is approved as amended.

Resolution No. M2022-17

Making Continued Findings Pursuant to Assembly Bill 361
to Continue Public Meetings Remotely
for MCOG’s Legislative and Advisory Bodies
During the COVID-19 State of Emergency
[Reso. #M2022-17 is incorporated herein by reference]

5. Approval of June 6, 2022 Minutes. Upon motion by Brown, second by Carter, and carried unanimously on roll call vote (*8 Ayes – Brown, Kanne, Albin-Smith, Ignacio, Haschak, Carter, Ahlstrand/PAC, and Gjerde; 0 Noes; 0 Abstaining; 0 Absent*): IT IS ORDERED that the minutes are approved as written.

6. Public Expression. None.

7. Adoption of Resolution Approving the FY 2022/23 Project List for the California State of Good Repair Program – Mendocino Transit Authority – Ukiah Transit Center. Ms. Orth summarized her written staff report, describing a brief history of this funding source and allocations made annually by MCOG. Mendocino Transit Authority (MTA) had submitted a project list to the State’s online reporting tool by the due date of September 1 as required, consisting of one project, development of a new Ukiah Transit Center. The only pending item was a resolution by MTA’s board as support documentation, received after the agenda packet was distributed, with no changes to the project information submitted or to MCOG’s draft resolution exhibit. The requested allocation of \$149,139 was within the available fund balance. Timing for this project is good, as MCOG currently has a planning project in the work program to locate a transit center site. Staff recommended approval. The Chair invited public comment; no one spoke to the item.

Upon motion by Brown, second by Haschak, and carried unanimously on roll call vote (8 Ayes – Brown, Kanne, Albin-Smith, Ignacio, Haschak, Carter, Ahlstrand/PAC, and Gjerde; 0 Noes; 0 Abstaining; 0 Absent): IT IS ORDERED that the following resolution is approved.

Resolution No. M2022-18

Approving the FY 2022/23 Project List for the
California State of Good Repair Program
[Reso. #M2022-18 is incorporated herein by reference]

8. Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Recommendation of September 21, 2022: Award of Local Transportation Fund (LTF) Two Percent Bicycle & Pedestrian Program Funds. Ms. Ellard summarized in her written staff report. Just one application was received, from Mendocino County Department of Transportation for facilities in two locations, one in Ukiah and one in Covelo, corresponding with a pending State Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) grant application that would cover 90 percent of project costs. The TAC recommended approval.

Alicia Meier of MCDOT gave further comments and details of the project proposal, which was included in the agenda packet. The Chair invited public comment. Mr. Dave Shpak of Gualala expressed compliments on these project investments and called attention to similar pedestrian needs identified in studies and plans of the County’s south coastal area for future funding cycles.

In Board discussion, Director Haschak asked how the two projects were selected and costs estimated. Ms. Meier replied the engineer’s estimates were used, but did not have more specific information. The recently completed Local Road Safety Plans identified priorities countywide. Ms. Barrett added that the safety plans were a requirement of the HSIP grants and awards are based on data and accident history, so the south coast locations did not rise to the top using those criteria. She was encouraged to see grant proposals so promptly resulting from MCOG’s planning efforts.

Upon motion by Haschak, second by Carter, and carried unanimously on roll call vote (8 Ayes – Brown, Kanne, Albin-Smith, Ignacio, Haschak, Carter, Ahlstrand/PAC, and Gjerde; 0 Noes; 0 Abstaining; 0 Absent): IT IS ORDERED that the Technical Advisory Committee’s recommendation is approved and \$175,000 of Local Transportation Fund (LTF) Two Percent Bicycle & Pedestrian Program Funds is awarded to Mendocino County Department of Transportation for the “Mendocino County Roadway Systemic Improvements I – South State Street (Ukiah) and Crawford Road (Covelo)” projects.

9. Recess as Policy Advisory Committee – Reconvene as RTPA – Ratify Action of Policy Advisory Committee. Upon motion by Carter, second by Ignacio, and carried unanimously on roll call vote (7 Ayes – Brown, Kanne, Albin-Smith, Ignacio, Haschak, Carter, and Gjerde; 0 Noes; 0 Abstaining; 0 Absent): IT IS ORDERED that the actions taken by the Policy Advisory Committee are ratified by the MCOG Board of Directors.

10. Reports - Information

- a. Caltrans District 1 – Projects Update and Information. Director Ahlstrand introduced Julia Peterson, who reported on local projects in the Clean California program. The funding goes to beautify, reduce litter, install public art, build trails and related community projects. Approximately 5,000 cubic yards of debris and 264 appliances were collected from Covelo over six full days, for a successful event. Covelo had been nominated for the cleanup program more than any other community, so they spent more time there than usual. Also two of eight beautification projects were completed in the county. A second cycle is coming up, with a call for projects in early January, due in February. Caltrans offers technical assistance by a grant manager for the application process.

Discussion and questions followed including:

 - Eligibility, results data and funding details. (Gjerde, Peterson)
 - Thanks and feedback that it was well worth the effort, participants were pleased with the results. (Haschak)
 - Illegal dump sites in Willits need to be addressed next cycle. (Kanne)
 - Gualala’s cleanup day was popular, with excess demand, could do again. (Shpak)
 - Interest in co-locating electric vehicle chargers with public parklets. (Gjerde)
 - Example of a Caltrans vista turnout property on SR 299 where a cleanup was done and new amenities are being installed such as toilets, picnic benches, EV chargers, bicycle racks, dog waste stations and trash cans. Other sites and opportunities are welcome for grant applications. (Peterson)
 - MCOG’s Information Packet includes a link to Caltrans’ survey. Staff is available by email to answer further questions. (Barrett, Peterson, Ahlstrand)
- b. Mendocino Transit Authority. Mr. Sookne reported on behalf of General Manager Jacob King: a Request for Proposals was released for the Short Range Transit Development Plan update.
- c. Great Redwood Trail Agency. Director Haschak reported on the September 19 meeting, where a presentation was received from consultant Alta Planning’s leadership team on their community engagement program for the master plan; the slides were sent to MCOG staff to share. Public outreach will start with the new year, continue for about six months, with a report due November 2023.
- d. MCOG Staff - Summary of Meetings. Ms. Barrett referred to the written report.
- e. MCOG Administration Staff
 - i. *Miscellaneous*. Ms. Orth reported status of triennial performance audits; a presentation to the Council is scheduled for the November meeting.

In Board questions, Ms. Barrett gave a brief update in reply to a question about the Covelo SR 162 Corridor Multi-Purpose Trail project. After a second solicitation, Resident Engineer Services had been contracted with Ghirardelli Associates for construction management and a kickoff meeting completed. Construction would be advertised for bids by week’s end, for selection in mid-November. Mr. Sookne reported that if bids do not come in within budget, staff will seek additional funds through Caltrans. If all goes as planned and depending on weather conditions, some work could be accomplished before March 15 to avoid delays related to the bird nesting season.
 - ii. *Next Meeting Date*. Monday, November 7, 2022.
- f. MCOG Planning Staff

i. *Feasibility Study - Mobility Solutions for Rural Communities of Inland Mendocino County.* Ms. Ellard reported that listening sessions were held during August in each of the five communities; the consultant AMMA Transit Planning analyzed the input for a followup survey. A second round of mailers will go out to each household promoting the survey. After analysis of survey results, the consultant will develop recommended mobility solutions for a final report to MCOG by August 2023. Staff hopes this will lead to services that can be implemented to resolve unmet transportation needs.

Director Kanne expressed appreciation on behalf of participants in the Brooktrails listening session, who are hopeful that creative transportation solutions can be found.

ii. *Miscellaneous.* Ms. Ellard reported a Request for Proposals was issued to procure a consultant for the feasibility study and location analysis of a new Ukiah Transit Center; proposals are due October 14. This grant-funded study has a budget of \$150,000 for a contractor, in MCOG's transportation planning work program.

g. MCOG Directors. Director Kanne reported she and Supervisor Mulheren hosted a successful cleanup in September of an illegal dump site in a Brooktrails cul-de-sac, where volunteers filled two trailers with 6,000 pounds of debris; another work day is scheduled for October 22 to complete the cleanup. She encouraged other jurisdictions to do similar projects, as volunteers are willing to work. Letters of support from various agencies are invited to close motorized access to these sites, so that local groups can pursue more trail building and other public uses. Director Haschak announced a public hearing October 18 to consider the closing of Dogwood Terrace in Brooktrails.

Director Albin-Smith reported attending all but one of the the Mobility Solutions listening sessions described above; each had different responses, and she praised the consultants' work.

Director Gjerde made a suggestion that City of Ukiah's municipal utility provide services for electric vehicle grant implementation in neighboring jurisdictions, as a potential revenue stream that could fulfill a local need for such expertise.

h. California Association of Councils of Governments (CALCOG) Delegates. Ms. Orth reported highlights of the most recent board meeting of September 23. The next meeting will be in person, November 29 in San Jose. The annual Regional Leadership Forum also will be back in person, March 6-8, 2023 in Riverside; board members are encouraged to attend and MCOG has a budget for travel expenses. In Board discussion, Director Albin-Smith noted that new Brown Act rules become effective in January; also she preferred remote meetings. Director Gjerde commented on the energy data from climate discussions, relative to reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

11. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

Submitted: NEPHELE BARRETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

By Janet Orth, Deputy Director & CFO



MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Agenda # 7a
Regular Calendar
MCOG Meeting
11/7/2022

STAFF REPORT

TITLE: Presentation and Acceptance of MCOG Triennial Performance Audit

SUBMITTED BY: Janet Orth, Deputy Director & CFO

DATE: 10/25/2022

BACKGROUND:

According to the Transportation Development Act (TDA), MCOG is required to "*designate an independent entity to make a performance audit*" of MCOG every three years (Section 99246). The contractor, Moore & Associates, has completed the final report of its performance audit of MCOG for the period ended June 30, 2021, after review and comment by staff. It covers Fiscal Years 2018/19, 2019/20, and 2020/21. The lead auditor for this audit, Ms. Kathy Chambers, will provide a presentation at our meeting.

Compliance with TDA. We are pleased to receive another favorable report of performance: "*Based on the current review, we submit no TDA compliance findings.*" Fifteen applicable compliance requirements are listed and described in the report. – *Executive Summary and Chapter 3, Pages 11-15*

Prior performance audit recommendations. Of the two recommendations, both are implemented. The first, "*Consider an alternate funding formula for senior center TDA funds,*" was completed and effective FY 2022/23. The second, "*Confirm alignment of MCOG personnel roles and responsibilities with RTPA functions,*" is considered done, with appropriate workload for the current organization, while noting new demands on staff time. – *Executive Summary and Chapter 4, Pages 17-18*

Current recommendations. One functional finding (not a compliance finding) was identified: "*The fiscal audit of Mendocino Transit Authority does not include details regarding the MTA's operating and capital reserve funds*" The finding is made in both MCOG and MTA's performance audit reports, since we engage the annual fiscal auditor for MTA. This is in reference to MTA's internal operating and capital reserve funds, not the capital reserve fund we maintain on MTA's behalf. – *Executive Summary and Chapter 7, Pages 27-28*

The full report is attached to the agenda packet. It serves as a useful overview of the Council's operations and a valuable resource going forward, in addition to the necessary review of past performance. Staff welcomes questions or discussion of any aspect the board wishes to review.

ACTION REQUIRED:

Accept the final audit report as prepared by Moore & Associates.

ALTERNATIVES:

The Council may delay or decline acceptance. Regardless of MCOG's actions, the report must be submitted to Caltrans as required by TDA.

RECOMMENDATION:

Receive the presentation and accept the triennial performance audit of MCOG as prepared by the independent auditor consultant, Moore & Associates. Consider keeping the audit report with your board materials for future reference.



MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Agenda # 7b
Regular Calendar
MCOG Meeting
11/7/2022

STAFF REPORT

TITLE: Acceptance of Triennial Performance Audit of Mendocino Transit Authority

SUBMITTED BY: Janet Orth, Deputy Director & CFO

DATE: 10/28/2022

BACKGROUND:

According to the Transportation Development Act (TDA), MCOG is required to "designate an independent entity to make a performance audit" of both MCOG and MTA every three years (Section 99246). The independent contractor, Moore & Associates, has turned in the final report of MTA's performance audit for the period ended June 30, 2021. A presentation will be provided in addition to the attached report. Overall, MTA received a favorable audit. Some highlights:

Compliance with TDA. Thirteen applicable compliance requirements are listed and described in the report. Two Assembly bills provided some regulatory relief during the pandemic. One compliance finding was made, of a late report to the State Controller. – *Executive Summary and Chapter 3, Pages 9- 12*

Prior performance audit recommendations. Of the four recommendations, two are implemented and two are in progress. One of these is identical to MCOG's, pertaining to a new funding formula for senior centers' contracted specialized services, which is now in effect. The updated Short Range Transit Development Plan is funded this year and procurement of a consultant in progress. The other two deal with performance data. – *Executive Summary and Chapter 4, Pages 13- 15*

Current recommendations. There are two Functional Recommendations; one is the same as for MCOG, dealing with audit of reserve accounts. The other concerns meeting the required farebox recovery ratio, since not all legislative relief can be expected to continue. – *Executive Summary and Chapter 8, Pages 39-43*

Performance Analysis. The performance audit verifies data that, under California law, transit operators must monitor and report on an annual basis, using certain performance indicators. Performance trends revealed that operating costs were down during the audit period as services were cut, but increased by 35% over the past six years. Ridership declined most significantly during the pandemic, resulting in a net decrease of 75% across six years. Details and other observations are made in the report, including summaries of MCOG's annual transit performance reviews. – *Chapter 6, Pages 19-29*

A thorough Functional Review of the organization and services is provided in Chapter 7. *"The program is well-organized and lines of reporting and managerial authority are defined and effective. However, despite having returned all eligible and willing employees from layoff, the agency has faced challenges returning to a fully staffed status, especially with drivers and a grants manager. This presents barriers to reinstating services due to the lack of available operators and support staff."* We're pleased to note: *"The agency has an open, collaborative, and productive relationship with MCOG."*

The full report is attached to the agenda packet. I will certify to Caltrans that the performance audit of the transit operator under MCOG's jurisdiction has been completed, as required by TDA.

ACTION REQUIRED:

Accept the audit report as presented. (Action not required but recommended.)

ALTERNATIVES:

The Council could defer acceptance to the MTA Board, which was done at their board meeting of October 26, or delegate review and recommendation to MCOG's Transit Productivity Committee. In any case, we expect it will be a useful resource for the committee.

RECOMMENDATION:

Receive the presentation and accept the triennial performance audit of Mendocino Transit Authority as prepared by the independent auditor consultant, Moore & Associates.

Enc: FY 2018/19 - 2020/21 Triennial Performance Audit of MTA



MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Agenda # 8
Regular Calendar
MCOG Meeting
11/07/2022

STAFF REPORT

TITLE: Covelo SR 162 Corridor Multi-Purpose Trail – Cash Flow for Construction Phase

SUBMITTED BY: Janet Orth, Deputy Director & CFO
with James Sookne, Program Manager

DATE: 10/25/2022

BACKGROUND:

The Covelo SR 162 Multi-Purpose Trail project is now in the construction phase. MCOG has procured the necessary Resident Engineer Services and has signed a contract with Ghirardelli Associates, Inc. with notice to proceed issued September 15. Bids for construction will be opened November 15, as advertised on MCOG's website and through the usual clearinghouses. The total allocation for this phase is approximately \$4 million from the Active Transportation Program (ATP) state grant and Caltrans' State Highway Operation & Protection Program (SHOPP). As previously authorized by MCOG, staff will proceed with the contract award process as long as the bid is within available funding. If bids exceed available funding, staff will work with Caltrans to identify sources for full funding and will return to the Board for approval at a future meeting. One additional contract will also need to be awarded for construction design services. Financial needs for that contract will be determined following award of the construction contract.

Staff estimates monthly invoices for the construction contractor could be as high as \$800,000 or so, plus monthly invoices for the resident engineer and other support services. These will need to be paid to the contractors, then reimbursement invoices submitted to Caltrans. While this process can be expedited, we must identify one or more of MCOG's 15 cash accounts that can temporarily cover these bills.

The most appropriate fund for this purpose is the Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) Program, formerly known as Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP), which is the most discretionary of MCOG's funding sources. Typically, the available fund balance is in the range of \$2 million or more, held for fiduciary purposes. The majority of that consists of formula allocations to MCOG's member agencies, who claim the funds as needed. In the unlikely event all were to be claimed at once, timing of payments could be made to accommodate cash flow.

Other sources of fiduciary funds are Transportation Development Act (TDA), which include two Local Transportation Fund reserves held for Mendocino Transit Authority. While these are routinely used by policy to cover the same kind of cash flow (on a smaller scale) for reimbursable Planning Work Elements, I suggest that we turn to these only as a secondary source if needed.

We do not recommend use of the nine Governmental/Special Revenue funds, which are dedicated to MCOG's day-to-day programs, and at last audit had a total fund balance of just \$540,080.

Staff does not anticipate any material risk to covering the cash flow as described. The Resident Engineer will ensure that only allowable costs are incurred, so full reimbursement can be expected. We invite questions and discussion of the project at our Board meeting.

ACTION REQUIRED:

Approve staff's recommendation to authorize the use of identified MCOG fund accounts to cover cash flow needs of the Covelo SR 162 Multi-Purpose Trail project expenditures during construction.

ALTERNATIVES:

None are identified.

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the use of MCOG's Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) Program fund account primarily, and Local Transportation Fund reserves secondarily, to cover cash flow needs of the Covelo SR 162 Multi-Purpose Trail project during the construction phase.



MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Agenda # 10d
Reports
MCOG Meeting
11/07/2022

STAFF REPORT

TITLE: Summary of Meetings

DATE PREPARED: 10/31/2022

SUBMITTED BY: Jody Lowblad, Administrative Assistant

BACKGROUND: Since our last regular MCOG meeting packet, MCOG Administration and Planning staff have attended (or will have attended) the following meetings on behalf of MCOG:

Date	Meeting/Event	Staff
Oct 6	Mobility Solutions Grant Meeting	Barrett, Ellard & Rodriguez
Oct 7, Nov 3	CALCOG Equity Training	Barret, Davey-Bates & Ellard
Oct 11	Covelo Project Development Team (PDT) Meeting	Barrett & Sookne
Oct 12	Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPA) Group Meeting	Barrett & Orth
Oct 12-13	California Transportation Commission (CTC) Meeting	Barrett & Davey-Bates
Oct 13	Social Media/Public Engagement Webinar	Ellard
Oct 13	Climate Adaptation Grants - CTC Guidelines Workshop	Ellard
Oct 14	North State Super Region Meeting	Barrett & Orth
Oct 17	Rural Counties Task Force - Induced Demand Study Kick-off	Barrett & Davey-Bates
Oct 18	Covelo Construction Management Meeting	Barrett & Sookne
Oct 18	Mendocino County Tribes and Caltrans Fall Meeting	Ellard
Oct 18	Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Legislative Workshop	Davey-Bates
Oct 19	Clean California Grant – Covelo Meeting	Barrett
Oct 19	Hopland Municipal Advisory Committee Meeting	Ellard & Orth
Oct 21	CALCOG Directors Association of California (CDAC) Meeting	Barrett
Oct 21	Mendocino Transit Authority (MTA) Meeting - Short Range Transit Development Plan (SRTDP)	Ellard
Oct 24	Great Redwood Trail Master Plan – Kick off Meeting	Ellard
Oct 25	Consultant Selection – Ukiah Transit Center	Ellard & Sookne
Oct 25	Covelo Project Development Team (PDT) Meeting	Barrett, Sookne & Villa
Oct 26	North State Zero Emission Vehicle (ZEV) Working Group	Orth & Rodriguez
Oct 26	California Associations of Council of Governments (CalCOG) REAP Housing Meeting	Barrett
Oct 26	Rural Electric Vehicle Charging Grant Meeting with ChargePoint	Orth
Oct 26	North State Zero Emission Vehicle (ZEV) Working Group Meeting	Orth
Oct 27	Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) & California Transportation Plan (CTP) Guidelines Kickoff Workshop	Ellard
Oct 27	Covelo Clean California Steering Committee Meeting	Ellard
Oct 28	CTC Climate Adaptation Program Guidelines Development Workshop	Ellard
Oct 31	Great Redwood Trail Agency (GRTA) Meeting	Ellard
Nov 1	Clean California Meeting	Barrett
Nov 1	Hopland Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Project Development Team (PDT) Meeting	Barrett & Villa
Nov 3	Clean California Cycle 2 Workshop	Ellard
Nov 1-4	CALACT Autumn Conference & Expo	Sookne

We will provide information to the Board regarding the outcome of any of these meetings as requested.

ACTION REQUIRED: None.

ALTERNATIVES: None identified.

RECOMMENDATION: None. This is for information only.

**2023 Active Transportation Program
Staff Recommendations
Statewide and Small Urban & Rural Components**

The Active Transportation Program was created by Senate Bill 99 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review, Chapter 359, Statutes of 2013) and Assembly Bill 101 (Committee on Budget, Chapter 354, Statutes of 2013) to encourage increased use of active modes of transportation, such as biking and walking. The Active Transportation Program consists of three components: the Statewide component (50% of the funds), the Small Urban & Rural component (10% of the funds), and the large Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) component (40% of the funds).

The 2023 Active Transportation Program Staff Recommendations for the Statewide and Small Urban & Rural Components are attached as Attachments A and B, respectively. Please be advised that these are the staff recommendations only. The program of projects will not be finalized until the Commission adopts the program at its December 7-8, 2022 meeting. Projects located within the boundaries of one of the ten large MPOs (Fresno Council of Governments, Kern Council of Governments, Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization, Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Sacramento Area Council of Governments, San Diego Association of Governments, San Joaquin Council of Governments, Southern California Association of Governments, Stanislaus Council of Governments, and Tulare County Association of Governments) that were not selected in the Statewide component will be considered for funding through the MPO component. Recommendations for the MPO component will be released on May 12, 2023 and considered by the Commission at its June 2023 meeting.

The 2023 Active Transportation Program Staff Recommendations for the Statewide and Small Urban & Rural components are summarized below.

Statewide Component

- 67 projects worth \$1.149 billion with \$853.52 million in Active Transportation Program funding
- 100% of funds directly benefit disadvantaged communities
- 43 projects are Safe Routes to School projects

Small Urban and Rural Component

- 26 projects worth \$209.187 million with \$170.704 million in Active Transportation Program funding
- 100% of funds directly benefit disadvantaged communities
- 19 projects are Safe Routes to School projects

The one-time, \$1.049 billion augmentation included in the Budget Act of 2022 significantly boosted the number of projects the Commission can fund through the 2023 Active Transportation Program. Without the augmentation, staff recommendations would have included 23 projects in the Statewide component and seven projects in the Small Urban & Rural component.

Background

The Active Transportation Program continues to experience tremendous unmet demand, as communities across the state look to the program to fund critical active transportation projects necessary to meet safety, climate, and equity goals. In light of the unmet need, the Commission recently embarked on a year-long effort to secure more funding for the program. This effort commenced in March 2021, when the Commission proposed a one-time, \$2 billion augmentation to reduce the backlog of critically needed, high-quality projects that had not received funding in previous cycles due to the program's lack of adequate funding. In June 2022, the Governor signed the Budget Act of 2022, which included a one-time Active Transportation Program funding augmentation of \$1.049 billion. While the Commission greatly appreciates this significant one-time augmentation from the Governor and Legislature to fund more projects, the need for additional funding for the program remains.

The Commission held a stakeholder workshop in July 2022 to discuss the distribution and implementation of the funding augmentation. Over 150 stakeholders attended, and there was widespread consensus to distribute all augmentation funding to the 2023 Active Transportation Program. Therefore, the Commission adopted an amended 2023 Active Transportation Program Fund Estimate at its August 2022 meeting, bringing the total funding available for the 2023 program to \$1.707 billion. Under the 2023 Active Transportation Program Guidelines, the Commission may program up to \$7 million of this total to Phase II Quick-Build Project Pilot Program projects in the Statewide component.

Applications to the 2023 Active Transportation Program were due on June 15, 2022. The California Transportation Commission (Commission) received 434 applications, with projects valued at \$4.3 billion and funding requests totaling a record \$3.1 billion. Additionally, the Commission received 11 applications to the Phase II Quick-Build Project Pilot Program, with projects valued at \$8.7 million and funding requests totaling \$8.2 million.

The Commission recruited 98 volunteer evaluators, who were divided into teams of two individuals. Each team reviewed nine to ten applications and scored them based on the screening and evaluation criteria set forth in the Commission's adopted 2023 Active Transportation Program Guidelines. The evaluator teams consisted of active transportation stakeholders with a wide range of expertise and from a variety of organizations, including local government agencies, regional transportation planning organizations, state agencies, community-based organizations, and advocacy organizations. Evaluator teams provided scores based on consensus for each question within each application and were required to provide constructive comments on all score sheets. Concurrently, Commission scored each project application and compared the evaluator consensus score to the staff score, and Caltrans staff reviewed the applications for eligibility and deliverability. Once the evaluations were complete, Commission and Caltrans staff met with each evaluator team to discuss any scoring differences and significant technical issues.

Commission staff evaluated the Phase II Quick-Build Project Pilot Program project applications based on the project selection criteria outlined in Appendix D of the 2023 Active Transportation Program Guidelines. Caltrans staff reviewed the projects for eligibility, deliverability, and alignment with quick-build project materials and principles.

The Active Transportation Program uses a sequential project selection process based on the scores the project applications received during the evaluation process. The project recommendation scoring threshold was 89 points for the Statewide component. There is not sufficient funding to fully fund all projects that achieved this scoring threshold. Therefore, consistent with the 2023 Active Transportation Program Guidelines, Commission staff used a secondary ranking system to choose which projects to recommend. This secondary ranking consisted of first prioritizing project readiness and then prioritizing projects that scored the highest on Question 2 of the application – Potential for Increased Walking and Biking. None of the Phase II Quick-Build Project Pilot Program project applications met the scoring threshold for the Statewide component. Therefore, no quick-build projects are recommended for funding. The project recommendation scoring threshold was 78 points for the Small Urban & Rural component. Only one Small Urban & Rural-eligible project achieved a score of 78, so a secondary ranking was not necessary.

During the eligibility screening process, Commission staff determined ten projects to be ineligible, including four quick-build projects. Commission staff contacted these applicants and informed them of their project's ineligible status prior to posting the staff recommendations.

**California Transportation Commission
2023 Active Transportation Program
Statewide Component
Staff Recommendations (\$1000s)**

Application ID	Project Title	County	Total Project Cost	ATP Funding	23-24	24-25	25-26	26-27	PA&ED	PS&E	R/W	CON	CON NI	Project Type	DAC	SRTS	Final Score
Active Transportation Resource Center	Active Transportation Resource Center	Statewide	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,000	Non-Infrastructure	Yes	N/A	N/A
7-Bell Gardens, City of-1*	Bell Gardens Complete Streets Improvements - Phase 2	Los Angeles	\$ 2,964	\$ 2,964	\$ 355	\$ -	\$ 2,609	\$ -	\$ 70	\$ 285	\$ -	\$ 2,609	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	Yes	No	99.5
7-Los Angeles County-2	Metro A Line Connections for Unincorporated Los Angeles County	Los Angeles	\$ 12,331	\$ 9,864	\$ 810	\$ -	\$ 3,028	\$ 6,026	\$ 810	\$ 520	\$ 2,508	\$ 6,026	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	No	99
3-Sacramento County-3	Stockton Blvd Complete Streets Project	Sacramento	\$ 15,721	\$ 363	\$ 363	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 363	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	No	98
6-Visalia, City of-2*	Houston Community Connectivity Project	Tulare	\$ 2,385	\$ 2,385	\$ 275	\$ 10	\$ 2,100	\$ -	\$ 75	\$ 200	\$ 10	\$ 2,100	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	Yes	Yes	98
6-Dinuba, City of-7*§	Building Dinuba's Active Transportation Future - Infrastructure & Non-Infrastructure	Tulare	\$ 17,235	\$ 13,147	\$ 2,195	\$ -	\$ 10,952	\$ -	\$ 833	\$ 1,223	\$ -	\$ 10,952	\$ 139	Infrastructure + NI - Large	Yes	Yes	98
7-Los Angeles, City of-2*§	Western Our Way: Walk and Wheel Improvements	Los Angeles	\$ 47,765	\$ 37,737	\$ 4,158	\$ -	\$ 2,239	\$ 31,340	\$ 4,158	\$ 2,239	\$ -	\$ 31,340	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	Yes	98
5-Lompoc, City of-1	City of Lompoc Walkability, Community Safety and School Investments Project	Santa Barbara	\$ 3,041	\$ 2,795	\$ 830	\$ 1,965	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 123	\$ -	\$ 1,965	\$ 707	Infrastructure + NI - Small	Yes	Yes	97.5
10-Stockton, City of-5	Downtown Stockton Weber Avenue Bike and Ped Connectivity	San Joaquin	\$ 11,842	\$ 9,427	\$ 420	\$ 1,690	\$ -	\$ 7,317	\$ 420	\$ 1,690	\$ -	\$ 7,317	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	No	97
8-Jurupa Valley, City of-1*	Jurupa Valley Mira Loma Area SRTS Sidewalk Gap Closure	Riverside	\$ 3,499	\$ 3,499	\$ 389	\$ 3,110	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10	\$ 379	\$ -	\$ 3,110	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	Yes	Yes	97
7-Los Angeles, City of-1*§	Osborne Street: Path to Park Access Project	Los Angeles	\$ 49,832	\$ 42,295	\$ 5,287	\$ -	\$ 2,266	\$ 34,742	\$ 5,287	\$ 2,266	\$ -	\$ 34,742	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	Yes	97
4-Bay Area Toll Authority-1*§	West Oakland Link of the Bay Skyway	Alameda	\$ 65,035	\$ 17,600	\$ -	\$ 17,600	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 17,600	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	No	97
7-El Monte, City of-1*	Traffic Calming for Parkway Dr/Denholm Dr	Los Angeles	\$ 5,846	\$ 4,334	\$ 4,334	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,334	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	96.5
8-Riverside County-3	Desert Edge Mobility Plan	Riverside	\$ 300	\$ 300	\$ 300	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 300	Plan	Yes	No	96
5-Santa Barbara, City of-2*§	Westside and Lower West Neighborhood Active Transportation Plan Implementation	Santa Barbara	\$ 21,315	\$ 19,182	\$ 1,925	\$ 1,100	\$ -	\$ 16,157	\$ 1,925	\$ 1,000	\$ 100	\$ 16,059	\$ 98	Infrastructure + NI - Large	Yes	Yes	96
5-Monterey County-1	San Ardo Community and School Connections Through Active Transportation	Monterey	\$ 3,448	\$ 3,448	\$ 792	\$ 364	\$ 2,292	\$ -	\$ 85	\$ 326	\$ 38	\$ 2,292	\$ 707	Infrastructure + NI - Small	Yes	Yes	96
7-Commerce, City of-1*	Slauson Avenue Corridor & Citywide Pedestrian, Bike, Transit Improvements	Los Angeles	\$ 2,109	\$ 2,109	\$ 150	\$ -	\$ 1,959	\$ -	\$ 10	\$ 140	\$ -	\$ 1,959	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	Yes	Yes	96
3-Rancho Cordova, City of-1*§	Zinfandel Drive Bicycle and Pedestrian Overcrossing	Sacramento	\$ 27,320	\$ 19,956	\$ 19,956	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 19,956	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	Yes	95
5-Santa Cruz County-1*§	Coastal Rail Trail Segments 10 and 11	Santa Cruz	\$ 84,672	\$ 67,599	\$ 5,764	\$ 61,835	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,973	\$ 1,796	\$ 61,835	\$ 995	Infrastructure + NI - Large	Yes	Yes	95
5-Watsonville, City of-1*	Safe Routes to Downtown Watsonville	Santa Cruz	\$ 8,687	\$ 6,948	\$ 616	\$ 507	\$ -	\$ 5,825	\$ -	\$ 507	\$ -	\$ 5,825	\$ 616	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	Yes	Yes	95
7-Los Angeles, City of-7*§	LA River Greenway, East San Fernando Valley Gap Closure	Los Angeles	\$ 49,401	\$ 34,401	\$ 3,200	\$ 4,200	\$ -	\$ 27,001	\$ 3,200	\$ 3,600	\$ 600	\$ 27,001	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	No	95
4-Berkeley, City of-1*	Addison Street Bicycle Boulevard Extension Project	Alameda	\$ 6,165	\$ 4,870	\$ 99	\$ 529	\$ -	\$ 4,242	\$ 99	\$ 529	\$ -	\$ 4,242	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	No	95
3-Yuba County-1*§	West Linda Comprehensive Safe Routes to School Project	Yuba	\$ 26,624	\$ 21,166	\$ 2,269	\$ 60	\$ 18,837	\$ -	\$ 756	\$ 1,513	\$ -	\$ 18,837	\$ 60	Infrastructure + NI - Large	Yes	Yes	95
11-San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)-2	Central Avenue Bikeway - The Missing Link	San Diego	\$ 4,141	\$ 2,834	\$ 2,834	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,834	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	95
5-Santa Maria, City of-1*	Active Santa Maria Safe Routes to School Corridor Improvements	Santa Barbara	\$ 8,131	\$ 7,721	\$ 150	\$ 1,040	\$ 6,531	\$ -	\$ 150	\$ 440	\$ 600	\$ 6,531	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	94
6-Porterville, City of-1	HAWK Pedestrian Crossings Project	Tulare	\$ 1,859	\$ 1,519	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,519	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,519	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	Yes	No	94
3-Sacramento, City of-1	Franklin Boulevard Complete Street - Phase 3	Sacramento	\$ 12,493	\$ 1,577	\$ 1,157	\$ 420	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,157	\$ 420	\$ -	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	No	94
7-City of Los Angeles, City of-9*§	Skid Row Connectivity and Safety Project	Los Angeles	\$ 47,566	\$ 38,599	\$ 4,260	\$ -	\$ 3,246	\$ 31,093	\$ 4,260	\$ 2,434	\$ 812	\$ 31,093	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	Yes	94
4-Contra Costa County-5	Pacifica Avenue Safe Routes to School Project	Contra Costa	\$ 4,342	\$ 3,902	\$ 375	\$ 200	\$ -	\$ 3,327	\$ 375	\$ 200	\$ -	\$ 3,327	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	94
4-Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority-1*§	Bascom Avenue Complete Street Project (I-880 to Hamilton Avenue)	Santa Clara	\$ 46,685	\$ 39,103	\$ -	\$ 39,103	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 39,103	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	No	93
3-Sacramento County-1*	Elkhorn Boulevard Complete Streets Project	Sacramento	\$ 9,122	\$ 8,075	\$ 44	\$ 966	\$ -	\$ 7,065	\$ 44	\$ 612	\$ 354	\$ 6,837	\$ 228	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	Yes	Yes	93

**California Transportation Commission
2023 Active Transportation Program
Statewide Component
Staff Recommendations (\$1000s)**

Application ID	Project Title	County	Total Project Cost	ATP Funding	23-24	24-25	25-26	26-27	PA&ED	PS&E	R/W	CON	CON NI	Project Type	DAC	SRTS	Final Score
5-Santa Barbara, City of-3	Milpas Street Crosswalk Safety and Sidewalk Widening Project	Santa Barbara	\$ 9,995	\$ 7,995	\$ 1,000	\$ 275	\$ -	\$ 6,720	\$ 1,000	\$ 275	\$ -	\$ 6,720	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	93
3-Nevada County Transportation Commission-1	SR 174/49/20 Roundabout and Active Transportation Safety Project	Nevada	\$ 6,815	\$ 5,439	\$ 200	\$ 1,125	\$ -	\$ 4,114	\$ 200	\$ 900	\$ 225	\$ 4,114	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	93
10-Stockton, City of-1	Alpine Pershing Mendocino Bicycle-Pedestrian Connectivity	San Joaquin	\$ 8,238	\$ 7,403	\$ 389	\$ 813	\$ -	\$ 6,201	\$ 389	\$ 723	\$ 90	\$ 6,201	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	No	93
2-Redding, City of-1	Butte Street Boogie Network Project	Shasta	\$ 8,048	\$ 6,437	\$ 821	\$ 834	\$ -	\$ 4,782	\$ 555	\$ 834		\$ 4,782	\$ 266	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	Yes	Yes	93
7-Los Angeles, City of-5 [§]	Wilmington Safe Streets: A People First Approach	Los Angeles	\$ 40,784	\$ 32,331	\$ 3,823	\$ -	\$ 1,748	\$ 26,760	\$ 3,823	\$ 1,748	\$ -	\$ 26,760	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	Yes	93
3-Paradise, Town of-4 [§]	Go Paradise: Pentz Student Pathway	Butte	\$ 23,293	\$ 22,009	\$ 2,098	\$ -	\$ 19,911	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 150	\$ 1,948	\$ 19,911	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	No	93
7-Lancaster, City of-2	Lancaster SRTS Master Plan - Refresh, Rebuild, Recruit, Sustain	Los Angeles	\$ 902	\$ 796	\$ 796	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 796	Non-Infrastructure	Yes	Yes	92
10-San Joaquin County-4	Harrison Elementary Active Transportation Improvements	San Joaquin	\$ 4,889	\$ 3,886	\$ 114	\$ 556	\$ 3,216	\$ -	\$ 114	\$ 556	\$ -	\$ 3,216	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	No	92
8-Coachella Valley Association of Governments-1 [§]	Coachella Valley Arts & Music Line	Riverside	\$ 46,099	\$ 36,483	\$ 36,483	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 36,483	\$ -	Infrastructure + NI - Large	Yes	Yes	92
11-National City, City of-3*	24th Street Transit Center Connections	San Diego	\$ 3,498	\$ 3,496	\$ 148	\$ 445	\$ -	\$ 2,903	\$ 148	\$ 445	\$ -	\$ 2,903	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	Yes	No	92
5-San Luis Obispo, City of-1	South Higuera Complete Streets Project	San Luis Obispo	\$ 8,817	\$ 6,951	\$ 6,951	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,951	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	92
6-Fresno County-1	Del Rey Sidewalk Project	Fresno	\$ 3,014	\$ 2,982	\$ 99	\$ 417	\$ 61	\$ 2,405	\$ 99	\$ 417	\$ 61	\$ 2,405	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	Yes	Yes	92
6-Kern County - D6-1	Norris Pedestrian and Railroad Safety Project	Kern	\$ 9,793	\$ 8,782	\$ 1,059	\$ 2,302	\$ 5,421	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,059	\$ 2,302	\$ 5,421	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	91
12-Orange County-1 [§]	OC Loop Segment P and Q	Orange	\$ 60,187	\$ 45,921	\$ 5,699	\$ 40,222	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,699	\$ 40,222	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	No	91
10-Calaveras County-1*	San Andreas Pope Street and Safe Routes to School Project	Calaveras	\$ 9,997	\$ 9,867	\$ 470	\$ -	\$ 1,600	\$ 7,797	\$ 470	\$ 1,000	\$ 600	\$ 7,797	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	91
3-Sacramento, City of-2	Envision Broadway in Oak Park	Sacramento	\$ 14,320	\$ 1,101	\$ -	\$ 1,101	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,101	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	No	91
6-Corcoran, City of-1	City of Corcoran Equitable Health, Safety & Connectivity Project	Kings	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,500	\$ 50	\$ 972	\$ 2,478	\$ -	\$ 50	\$ 520	\$ 452	\$ 2,478	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	Yes	Yes	91
3-West Sacramento, City of-1 [§]	I Street Bridge Deck Conversion for Active Transportation Project	Yolo	\$ 22,561	\$ 16,029	\$ 16,029	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 16,029	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	No	91
2-Susanville, City of-1*	Riverside Drive Pedestrian and Bike Trail Project	Lassen	\$ 3,111	\$ 2,861	\$ 400	\$ -	\$ 2,461	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 400	\$ 2,461	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	Yes	No	91
5-Santa Barbara, City of-1 [§]	Cliff Drive: Urban Highway to Complete Street Transformation Project	Santa Barbara	\$ 33,991	\$ 27,191	\$ 1,920	\$ 1,116	\$ -	\$ 24,155	\$ 1,920	\$ 1,086	\$ 30	\$ 24,087	\$ 68	Infrastructure + NI - Large	Yes	Yes	91
7-Hawaiian Gardens, City of-1	Hawaiian Gardens Bicycle Master Plan	Los Angeles	\$ 370	\$ 370	\$ 370	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 370	Plan	Yes	No	91
7-Los Angeles, City of-4 [§]	Normandie Beautiful: Creating Neighborhood Connections in South LA	Los Angeles	\$ 27,774	\$ 23,579	\$ 2,740	\$ -	\$ 1,475	\$ 19,364	\$ 2,740	\$ 1,475	\$ -	\$ 19,364	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	Yes	91
7-San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments-2*	Montebello Railroad Safety Crossings Improvements	Los Angeles	\$ 7,388	\$ 5,906	\$ 5,906	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,906	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	91
4-San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency-2 [§]	Bayview Multimodal Community Corridor	San Francisco	\$ 15,445	\$ 12,325	\$ 2,807	\$ -	\$ 9,518	\$ -	\$ 300	\$ 1,650	\$ -	\$ 9,518	\$ 857	Infrastructure + NI - Large	Yes	Yes	90.5
11-Imperial Beach, City of-1 [§]	Palm Avenue Complete Multimodal Corridor	San Diego	\$ 26,227	\$ 23,112	\$ 150	\$ 1,220	\$ -	\$ 21,742	\$ 150	\$ 1,100	\$ 120	\$ 21,742	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	Yes	90
8-Jurupa Valley, City of-2*	Jurupa Valley Granite Hill Area SRTS Sidewalk Gap Closure	Riverside	\$ 4,240	\$ 3,390	\$ 490	\$ 2,900	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 60	\$ 430	\$ -	\$ 2,900	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	90
5-El Paso De Robles, City of-1 [§]	Niblick Road Complete and Sustainable Bike and Pedestrian Streets	San Luis Obispo	\$ 17,257	\$ 13,806	\$ 922	\$ 1,118	\$ -	\$ 11,766	\$ 922	\$ 1,118	\$ -	\$ 11,766	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	Yes	90
5-Santa Cruz, City of-1 [§]	Santa Cruz Rail Trail Segments 8 and 9 Construction	Santa Cruz	\$ 48,719	\$ 35,766	\$ 35,766	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500	\$ 34,274	\$ 992	Infrastructure + NI - Large	Yes	Yes	90
7-Ventura County-1	Saticoy Pedestrian Improvement & Community Connections Project	Ventura	\$ 3,497	\$ 3,497	\$ 225	\$ -	\$ 400	\$ 2,872	\$ 225	\$ 400	\$ -	\$ 2,872	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	Yes	Yes	90
3-Placerville, City of-1 [§]	Placerville Drive Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Phase 1	El Dorado	\$ 28,929	\$ 15,417	\$ -	\$ 15,417	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 15,417	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	No	90
4-Contra Costa County-6 [§]	San Pablo Avenue Complete Streets/Bay Trail Gap Closure Project	Contra Costa	\$ 11,717	\$ 10,517	\$ 1,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,517	\$ 1,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,517	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	No	90

**California Transportation Commission
2023 Active Transportation Program
Statewide Component
Staff Recommendations (\$1000s)**

Application ID	Project Title	County	Total Project Cost	ATP Funding	23-24	24-25	25-26	26-27	PA&ED	PS&E	R/W	CON	CON NI	Project Type	DAC	SRTS	Final Score
1-Eureka, City of-2*	C Street Bike Boulevard	Humboldt	\$ 2,405	\$ 2,344	\$ 2,344	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,344	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	Yes	Yes	90
12-Santa Ana, City of-13*	Orange Avenue Bike Lane and Bicycle Boulevard Project	Orange	\$ 5,827	\$ 5,827	\$ 85	\$ 851	\$ -	\$ 4,891	\$ 85	\$ 851	\$ -	\$ 4,891	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	90
8-Jurupa Valley, City of-3*	Jurupa Valley Agate Street Complete Streets Project	Riverside	\$ 1,272	\$ 1,272	\$ 140	\$ 1,132	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10	\$ 130	\$ -	\$ 1,132	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	Yes	Yes	90
7-Long Beach, City of-1*	Mid-City Bicycle and Pedestrian Connections	Los Angeles	\$ 9,797	\$ 8,817	\$ -	\$ 1,604	\$ -	\$ 7,213	\$ -	\$ 750	\$ -	\$ 7,213	\$ 854	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	Yes	No	89.5
11-San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)-1*†	Howard Bikeway: Connecting Vibrant San Diego Neighborhoods	San Diego	\$ 9,800	\$ 1,396	\$ 1,396	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,396	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	89
			\$ 1,149,392	\$ 853,520													

Notes
*Prior to programming, Caltrans will contact the applicant for project clarifications.
§Project requires a Baseline Agreement. Please see the SB 1 Accountability and Transparency Guidelines for more information.
†San Diego Association of Governments requested \$8,137,000 for the Howard Bikeway: Connecting Vibrant San Diego Neighborhoods project. However, only \$1,396,000 in programming capacity remains in the Statewide component. Commission staff will work with the applicant to determine if the project can be delivered with available ATP funding.

Abbreviations, Acronyms, and Initialisms			
CON:	Construction Phase	DAC:	Project benefits a Disadvantaged Community
NI:	Non-Infrastructure	PA&ED:	Project Approval & Environmental Document Phase
PS&E:	Plans, Specifications & Estimates Phase	SRTS:	Safe Routes to School Project
R/W:	Right-of-Way Phase		

**California Transportation Commission
2023 Active Transportation Program
Small Urban and Rural Component
Staff Recommendations (\$1000s)**

Application ID	Project Title	County	Total Project Cost	ATP Funding	23-24	24-25	25-26	26-27	PA&E	PS&E	R/W	CON	CON NI	Project Type	DAC	SRTS	Final Score
10-Tuolumne County-1	Groveland Community Connectivity Project	Tuolumne	\$ 3,036	\$ 3,036	\$ 160	\$ 220	\$ 100	\$ 2,556	\$ 160	\$ 220	\$ 100	\$ 2,556	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	Yes	Yes	89
10-Sonora, City of-1	SR 49 Gold Rush Multi-Use Path Phase 1	Tuolumne	\$ 6,418	\$ 5,018	\$ 233	\$ 1,220	\$ 3,565	\$ -	\$ 233	\$ 520	\$ 700	\$ 3,565	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	89
3-Butte County-1	South Oroville Bike and Ped Connectivity Project	Butte	\$ 9,286	\$ 7,786	\$ 7,786	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,904	\$ 882	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	Yes	Yes	88.5
5-Monterey County-3*	Community and School Connections Through Active Transportation	Monterey	\$ 6,463	\$ 6,463	\$ 1,045	\$ 488	\$ 4,930	\$ -	\$ 37	\$ 450	\$ 38	\$ 4,930	\$ 1,008	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	Yes	Yes	88.5
5-Arroyo Grande, City of-1	Halcyon Road Complete Streets Project	San Luis Obispo	\$ 9,170	\$ 8,169	\$ 1,304	\$ 6,865	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 648	\$ 656	\$ 6,765	\$ 100	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	Yes	Yes	88
10-Groveland Community Services District-1*	Hetch Hetchy Railroad Trail Project	Tuolumne	\$ 5,443	\$ 4,299	\$ 146	\$ 308	\$ 118	\$ 3,727	\$ 146	\$ 308	\$ 118	\$ 3,727	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	No	88
5-San Luis Obispo County-1	Morro Bay to Cayucos Multi-Use Trail Gap Closure Project	San Luis Obispo	\$ 13,170	\$ 7,406	\$ -	\$ 7,406	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,406	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	Yes	88
5-California Department of Transportation-1	Los Alamos Connected Community Project (SR 135)	Santa Barbara	\$ 8,525	\$ 8,075	\$ 710	\$ -	\$ 1,956	\$ 5,409	\$ 710	\$ 1,044	\$ 912	\$ 5,359	\$ 50	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	Yes	Yes	88
1-Eureka, City of-1	Bay to Zoo Trail	Humboldt	\$ 9,999	\$ 8,999	\$ 118	\$ 525	\$ 8,356	\$ -	\$ 118	\$ -	\$ 525	\$ 8,356	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	Yes	87
3-Paradise, Town of-2*§	Go Paradise: Neal Gateway Project	Butte	\$ 13,068	\$ 12,348	\$ 1,838	\$ -	\$ 10,510	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 352	\$ 1,486	\$ 10,510	\$ -	Infrastructure - Large	Yes	No	86
5-Santa Barbara County-2*	Isla Vista Bike and Pedestrian Improvements Project	Santa Barbara	\$ 8,998	\$ 7,107	\$ 308	\$ 517	\$ 6,272	\$ 10	\$ 308	\$ 375	\$ 142	\$ 6,272	\$ 10	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	Yes	Yes	87
5-Monterey County-2*	Chualar Community and School Connections Through Active Transportation	Monterey	\$ 6,349	\$ 6,349	\$ 1,694	\$ 4,655	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 270	\$ 513	\$ 38	\$ 4,617	\$ 911	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	Yes	Yes	86
2-Modoc County-2*	Surprise Valley School Safety and Community Connectivity Project	Modoc	\$ 3,021	\$ 3,021	\$ 144	\$ 208	\$ 2,669	\$ -	\$ 144	\$ 196	\$ 12	\$ 2,669	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	Yes	Yes	86
5-Salinas, City of-2*	Alisal Safe Routes to School Project	Monterey	\$ 1,084	\$ 998	\$ 998	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 913	\$ 85	Infrastructure + NI - Small	Yes	Yes	86
5-Santa Cruz, City of-2*	Swanton Delaware Multiuse Path	Santa Cruz	\$ 2,968	\$ 2,968	\$ 140	\$ 25	\$ 2,803	\$ -	\$ 10	\$ 130	\$ 25	\$ 2,803	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	Yes	No	86
1-Mendocino Council of Governments-1	Gualala Downtown Streetscape Enhancement Project	Mendocino	\$ 9,995	\$ 7,780	\$ 447	\$ -	\$ 7,333	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 265	\$ 182	\$ 7,333	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	No	85
6-Madera County-1	La Vina Community Mobility and Safety Enhancements Project	Madera	\$ 2,837	\$ 2,837	\$ 325	\$ 95	\$ 2,417	\$ -	\$ 25	\$ 300	\$ 95	\$ 2,417	\$ -	Infrastructure - Small	Yes	No	85
2-Redding, City of-2*	Victor Improvement Project	Shasta	\$ 9,992	\$ 7,993	\$ 904	\$ 1,045	\$ -	\$ 6,044	\$ 700	\$ 1,045	\$ -	\$ 6,044	\$ 204	Infrastructure + NI - Medium	Yes	Yes	84
5-Santa Cruz Health Services Agency-2	Safe Routes for Watsonville School Families and Community	Santa Cruz	\$ 1,921	\$ 1,881	\$ 1,881	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,881	Non-Infrastructure	Yes	Yes	84
5-Transportation Agency for Monterey County-1*	Fort Ord Regional Trail and Greenway: California Avenue Segment	Monterey	\$ 10,670	\$ 8,429	\$ 1,508	\$ 6,921	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 528	\$ -	\$ 6,921	\$ 980	Infrastructure + NI - Large	Yes	Yes	84
3-Nevada County Transportation Commission-2*§	SR 49 Multimodal Corridor Improvements, Nevada City	Nevada	\$ 17,357	\$ 13,863	\$ 1,250	\$ -	\$ 1,900	\$ 10,713	\$ 1,250	\$ 1,750	\$ 150	\$ 10,637	\$ 76	Infrastructure + NI - Large	Yes	Yes	83.5
5-King City, City of-1*§	San Antonio Drive Path & Safe Routes to Schools	Monterey	\$ 14,543	\$ 11,043	\$ 3,695	\$ 12	\$ 7,336	\$ -	\$ 350	\$ 1,050	\$ 12	\$ 7,336	\$ 2,295	Infrastructure + NI - Large	Yes	Yes	81
3-Paradise, Town of-1*	Go Paradise: Skyway Link Project	Butte	\$ 6,810	\$ 6,704	\$ 424	\$ 1,073	\$ -	\$ 5,207	\$ 424	\$ 715	\$ 358	\$ 5,207	\$ -	Infrastructure - Medium	Yes	No	80
3-Williams, City of-1*	E Street Complete Streets Project	Colusa	\$ 11,760	\$ 9,341	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,341	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,141	\$ 200	Infrastructure + NI - Large	Yes	Yes	80
5-University of California - Santa Cruz-1	UCSC "SlugBikeLife" Bike Safety and Education Program Phase 2	Santa Cruz	\$ 742	\$ 712	\$ 712	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 712	Non-Infrastructure	Yes	No	79
5-Salinas, City of-1*‡	Harden Parkway Path & Safe Routes to School project	Monterey	\$ 15,562	\$ 8,079	\$ 3,528	\$ -	\$ 10,478	\$ -	\$ 405	\$ 1,575	\$ -	\$ 10,478	\$ 1,548	Infrastructure + NI - Large	Yes	Yes	78
			\$ 209,187	\$ 170,704													

Notes
 *Prior to programming, Caltrans will contact the applicant for project clarifications.
 §Project requires a Baseline Agreement. Please see the SB 1 Accountability and Transparency Guidelines for more information.
 ‡The City of Salinas requested \$14,006,000 for the Harden Parkway Path & Safe Routes to School Project. However, only \$8,079,000 in programming capacity remains in the Small Urban & Rural component. Commission staff will work with the applicant to determine if the project can be delivered with available ATP funding.

Abbreviations, Acronyms, and Initialisms			
CON:	Construction Phase	DAC:	Project benefits a Disadvantaged Community
NI:	Non-Infrastructure	PA&E:	Project Approval & Environmental Document Phase
PS&E:	Plans, Specifications & Estimates Phase	SRTS:	Safe Routes to School Project
R/W:	Right-of-Way Phase		